

PRINTER RUSH

(PTO ASSISTANCE)

Application : 09/544,392 Examiner : Wilson GAU : 2826
 From : MWJ Location : IDC FMF FDC Date : 12/29/05

Tracking #: EPM 09/544,392 Week Date: 1/14/05

DOC CODE	DOC DATE	MISCELLANEOUS
<input type="checkbox"/> 1449		<input type="checkbox"/> Continuing Data
<input type="checkbox"/> IDS		<input type="checkbox"/> Foreign Priority
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> CLM	<u>9-19-05</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Document Legibility
<input type="checkbox"/> IIFW		<input type="checkbox"/> Fees
<input type="checkbox"/> SRFW		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
<input type="checkbox"/> DRW		<u>FWCLM (11-3-05)</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> OATH		<u>Index of claims</u>
<input type="checkbox"/> 312		
<input type="checkbox"/> SPEC		

[RUSH] MESSAGE:

① Claims 2 and 9 (original claims 3 and 12)
both depend on higher claim 1 (original
claim 2). Please advise.

Thanks

[XRUSH] RESPONSE:

He added several dependent claims onto orig cl. 1,
which will all necessarily be renumbered to
occur before orig. cl. 2. So, its ok that
orig. cl. 2 becomes cl. 21 after renumbering.

I did, however, find a different renumbering error, which is
noted on the attached Index of claims.

INITIALS: SW

NOTE: This form will be included as part of the official USPTO record, with the Response document coded as XRUSH.

REV 10/04

3/6/06